

462 women do rather more than half of the heavy carrying, but I have already noted that the men are really ready to assist if needed, and the men do considerable work, such as the very laborious basketwork, that might, a priori, be believed to be woman's work.

[17] The general pattern of this division of labor is typically Carib, but the details vary much from tribe to tribe. For instance planting, here done by the man, is commonly woman's work elsewhere and hammocks, here made by women, are often made by men elsewhere.

Legal Concepts

Property.

• 421 The Indians are not capitalists in that they have no permanent title to real property, no personal command of the means of production, no accumulated or hereditary wealth, and no property right in the labor of others. At the same time they have a very real and lively sense of personal property and in other ways also their society is decidedly not communistic. In general what an individual makes or uses is his. When he ceases to use it, it reverts to the public domain.

423 Thus it could be said that the land, in general, belongs to the tribe in common, or that it belongs to no one, but when a man clears a comuco or builds a house on a portion of land, that land is his. No one has the right to use it (or even to enter it against his wishes) as long as he is in occupation, and its products are exclusively his, free of any obligation to share or divide them. When he leaves it, however, he cannot transfer title to it. It reverts to common and any comer can occupy it or enjoy its fruits and use. The same is true of structures erected on the land.

592 Such property may be said to belong to the household group or to the
423 to-esa? as its leader and representative. Another very important special case
226 of such ownership is that of fishing rights. According to custom, which of course is the equivalent of uncoded law, a household established on or near a stream owns the fishing rights on that stream from its dwelling downstream as far as the next habitation. These rights are very rigidly maintained. Even a fish killed upstream is lost to the killer if it floats below the next household before being gathered. Of course several or many households do commonly unite in poisoning a given stretch of water and all share in the results, but this

[685] is only by invitation of the household owning the right to that water. Violation
[22] of these rights is among the most serious offenses known to the Indians, as is suggested by the fact that the last bloody war, of which they retain vivid but
[224] confused memories, is said to have arisen from such a violation. There seems, on the other hand, to be no proprietorship of hunting rights.